UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/329,558	06/10/1999	GRAHAM CHAPMAN	12463(CA998-	8251

7590   12/04/2003

RICHARD L CATANIA ESQ
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY AND PRESSER
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER
TANG, KENNETH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2127	

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	09/329,558	CHAPMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Kenneth Tang	2127

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *16 October 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .	6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This final action is in response to Paper Number 11, received on 10/16/03. Applicant's

arguments have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

2.   Application 09/329558 was filed on 6/10/99. Claims 1-23 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   **Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-13, 16-17, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Agesen (US 6,047,125) in view of Gosling (US 5,668,999).

Referring to claims 1 and 11, Agesen teaches the following limitations:

-       simulating stack actions for executing bytecodes along said path *("bytecode",*

        "stack", "execution", col 3, lines 62-65, and "pushed on stack by bytecode",

        "execution", col 11, lines 59-63);

-       mapping a path of control flow on the stack from any start point in a selected method

        to the destination program counter by locating a linear path from the beginning of the

        method to the destination program counter and iteratively processing an existing

bytecode sequence for each branch, and identifying said path as complete when said

destination program counter is reached.

Agesen discloses using a stack mapping *("stack map", "mapped to the same slot in the*

stack frame", col. 3, lines 13-47). It is inherent that all computer systems, including Ageson's

computer system, have a control processor (CPU) that controls the flow of every other units, thus

being known as the "brain of the computer." It is also inherent to one of ordinary skill in the art

that a processor (CPU) maintains a register known as the *program counter.* A program counter

holds the address of the current instruction. After an instruction completes, the processor

automatically and iteratively adds one to the program counter until computing instructions tell it

to stop. That's what a program counter does.

Ageson fails to explicitly teach:

-   constructing a virtual stack for storage in a pre-allocated memory location

However, Gosling discloses generating a "virtual stack" 344 from the step of simulating

stack actions executing "bytecodes" in memory *(col 5, lines 21-29).* It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the virtual stack

feature to the existing system of Agesen for the reason of being able to have an imaginary stack

to store bytecodes.

Agesen inherently the mapped path being complete when the destination program counter

is reached because this basically involves the definition of mapping, which Agesen teaches. In

mapping the path, the 1st element of the path corresponds to the 1st element of the program

counter. The 2nd element of the path corresponds to the 2nd element of the program counter, and

so forth, until both the path is complete and the destination program counter is reached.

Referring to claims 2 –3, and 12-13, Agesen teaches:

- processing a first linear bytecode sequence and an additional one until the control flow is interrupted *("two or more bytecode sequences", col 5, lines 19-27, and "Interrupt controller", Fig. 3A 135, col 7, lines 42-44);*

- recording unprocessed targets from any branches in the first and additional linear bytecode sequence for future processing *(Exception handler 760, bytecode 732, "stores a reference in variable 1", "branch to bytecode", col 11, lines 54-59).*

Ageson inherently teaches:

- the destination program counter was not reached during an earlier processing of a linear bytecode sequence

- the information stored in the reference can be used at a future time for processing.

Ageson does teach that the program counter was reached during the <u>later</u> processing of a bytecode sequence *(The bytecode 740 is stored in variable 2 value of the program counter, col 11, lines 45-47).* In Ageson's reference, the program counter does not get reached in the <u>earlier</u> processing.

Referring to claims 6 and 16, Agesen fails to explicitly teach generating a virtual stack from executing bytecodes along the path. However, Gosling discloses generating a "virtual stack" 344 from the step of simulating stack actions executing "bytecodes" *(col 5, lines 21-29).* It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to combine the virtual stack feature to the existing system of Agesen for the reason of being able

to have an imaginary stack to store bytecodes.

Referring to claims 7 and 17, Gosling discloses:

- storing the bitstring at a selected destination for use in memory management

  operations *(virtual stack 344 stored by bytecode, col 5, lines 33-40)*.

Gosling does not disclose:

- encoding the virtual stack as a bitstring

However, it is common knowledge that bitstrings can be encoded from binary.

Referring to claims 9 and 19, Agesen teaches storing the bitstring to a pre-allocated area

on the stack *("bytecode 704 stores the value (1) from the top of the operand stack", col 11, lines*

5-12).

Referring to claims 10 and 20, Agesen teaches inserting pre-determined stack actions for

bytecodes maintaining the control flow *("Bytecode 702 is used to push the integer value 1 on top*

of the operand stack", col 11, lines 5-6) and calculating stack actions for bytecodes transferring

the control flow *(bytecodes, stack, i=i+itmp, col 11, lines 19-23)*.

Referring to claims 21 and 22, it is inherent that computer-readable memory can be used

to store instructions.

Referring to claims 23, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 1-3.

4.   Claims 4-5, 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Agesen (US 6,047,125) in view of Agesen (US 5,909,579).

Referring to claims 4-5 and 14-15, Agesen (US 6,047,125) fails to explicitly teach:

-    determining if a bytecode in any linear bytecode sequence is a breakpoint with a pointer to bytecode data;

However Ageson (US 5,909,579) teaches a "bytecode analyzer mechanism" which determines the changes which the bytecode makes to the live pointer locations *(col 8, lines 20-24)*. In addition, the system has breakpoints or computation stops at bytecode boundaries for determining live pointer information *(col 3, lines 10-13)*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the determination of a breakpoint feature to the existing system of Ageson for the reason of improving control by having an interrupt mechanism.

Agesen (US 6,047,125) also fails to explicitly teach:

-    replacing the breakpoint with the bytecode data

However Ageson (US 5,909,579) also teaches an encoded bytecode change to the breakpoint or program stack frame pointer *(bytecode encoded, change, program stack frame live pointer, col 8, lines 25-30)*. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include the feature of replacing the breakpoint with the bytecode data for

the reason of giving the system more flexibility for optimizing garbage collection.

5.   **Claims 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Agesen**

(US 6,047,125) in view of Gosling (US 5,668,999) and further in view of O'Connor (US

6,098,089).

Referring to claims 8 and 18, Agesen in view of Gosling fails to explicitly teach storing

the bitstring on a heap. However, from the reference of O'Connor, it is well-known in the state

of the art that "garbage collection" of "heap-allocated storage" is an "attractive model for

dynamic memory management" *(col 1, lines 39-42).* It is known that dynamic refers to actions

that take place when they are needed (compile time) rather than in advance. For example, many

programs perform *dynamic memory allocation,* which means that they do not reserve memory

ahead of time, but seize sections of memory when needed. In general, such programs require less

memory, although they may run a little more slowly.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 11, and 23 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7.   *Applicant argues and states (page 13, 1ˢᵗ paragraph) that what is "unique to the invention is the notion that mapping stops, i.e. the path is complete, when the destination PC is reached for the first time. That is, there may be more than one path to get from the beginning of the method to the destination PC, but according to the invention, the mapping may stop as soon as the first path is established."*

In response, Applicant argues limitations that are not in the claimed invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kenneth Tang whose telephone number is (703) 305-5334. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are none for regular

communications and none for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

kt
November 28, 2003

PRIMARY EXA